



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SD
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/707,211	11/03/2000	Scott Nedderman	3553-4075US3	9636
27123	7590	01/13/2005	EXAMINER	
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			WILLETT, STEPHAN F	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2141		
DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application N .	Applicant(s)	
	09/707,211	NEDDERMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephan F Willett	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 September 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Applicant's election of Group I in Paper Filed 9/16/04 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP □ 818.03(a)).
2. The applicant's arguments with regard to the restriction are not persuasive. There is a burden on the examiner when an additional class must be searched for additional matter claimed in a different subclass, thus the restriction is not withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC □ 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U. S.C. 102(e) that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Abramson et al. with Patent Number 6,539,494.
3. Regarding claim(s) 1, 6, 11, 16, Abramson teaches recalling session information based on a session key as a session ID, col. 3, lines 54-62. Abramson teaches obtaining user provided information via a segment, col. 4, lines 11-15. Abramson teaches updating session information based on a current key, col. 4, lines 59-61. Abramson teaches validating the user provided

information from the segment, col. 4, lines 61-67 wherein validating is verifying an old session matches the new session along with validating other session parameters. Abramson teaches posting the user provided session information to a server when the user session is validated, col. 4, lines 16-17. Abramson teaches a processor, storage and a program, col. 3, lines 1-2, and 16-18..

4. Regarding claim(s) 2, 7, 12, 17, Abramson teaches the updated session information is updated to a cookie, col. 3, line 56.

5. Regarding claim(s) 3, 8, 13, 18, Abramson teaches the updated session information is updated to cache, col. 3, lines 44, 61; col. 4, lines 8-10 as cache associated with “tables”, “encoding”, and maintaining “mutable” session data at a client or server.

6. Regarding claim(s) 4-5, 9-10, 14-15, 19-20 Abramson teaches the updated session information is updated to a session server and/or information server, col. 5, lines 41-43; col. 6, lines 34-36.

Response to Amendment

1. The broad claim language used is interpreted on its face and based on this interpretation the claims have been rejected.

2. The limited structure claimed, without more functional language, reads on the references provided. Thus, Applicant’s arguments can not be held as persuasive regarding patentability.

3. Applicant suggests Abramson “does not teach updating whatsoever”, Paper filed 9/20/04, Page 2, line 13. However, Abramson teaches “recovers the user’s session data”, col. 4 ,lines 60-61 based on “receives the request”, col. 4, line 40 to create an “updated” session. Also, updating

Art Unit: 2141

session data is based on a session ID/key is clearly taught, col. 4, lines 9-16. The content of the reference has been maligned since “the recovery of such data “ can be “equivalent to the claimed ‘updating data’”, Paper filed 9/20/04, Page 2, line 19. The references should not be read in a vacuum, the teachings are not mutually exclusive, and must be taken in context of what was reasonable based on the subject matter as a whole as would have been understood at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. The descriptions in the references are not obfuscated by the numerous other suggested usages of said description in the reference. In addition, implicitly, impliedly and inferentially, various types of updating are taught and language identical or verbatim is not required in an obvious rejection. Note that reasonable “inferences”, and “common sense” may be considered in formulating rejections for obviousness. Specifically, *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968) states “in considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom.” Also, *In re Bozek*, 416 F.2d 738, 163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969) states that obviousness may be concluded from “common knowledge and common sense of the person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint or suggestion in a particular reference”. Additionally, see *In re Gauerke*, 24 CCPA 725, 86 F.2d 330, 31 USPQ 330, 333 (CCPA 1936), and *In re Libby*, 45 CCPA 944, 255 F.2d 412, 118 USPQ 94, 96 (CCPA 1958), and *In re Jacoby*, 309 F.2d 738, 125 USPQ 317, 319 (CCPA 1962), and *In re Wiggins*, 488 F.2d 538, 543, 1979 USPQ 421, 424 (CCPA 1973). Thus, Applicant’s arguments can not be held as persuasive regarding patentability.

4. Applicant suggests Abramson “clearly does not evince any validation”, Paper filed

9/20/04, Page 3, line 3. However, verifying old data or even finding old data verifies the user's information. Again, validating "user specific" session data is clearly taught, col. 4, lines 9-16. Thus, Applicant's arguments can not be held as persuasive regarding patentability.

Conclusion

7. Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is disclosed in the Notice of References Cited. A close review of the references is suggested, such as Montulli with US Patent Number 5,774,670. The other references cited teach numerous other ways to update and maintain session data, thus a close review of them is suggested.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

6. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephan Willett whose telephone number is (571) 272-3890. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.
8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 272-0044.
9. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

sfw

January 10, 2005



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER